

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 JULIET S. SARIOL,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and
14 NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY
ORGANIZATION,

15 Defendants.
16

CASE NO. C19-155-MJP

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
REINSTATEMENT

17 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Case Reinstatement.
18 (Dkt. No. 11.) Having reviewed the Motion and all related papers, the Court DENIES the
19 Motion.

20 Plaintiff Juliet S. Sariol filed this case alleging "civil theft conversion of property under
21 historical circumstance statute of time limitations and counter claiming informal civil proceeding
22 in pursuant to 5 U.S.C.A. (a, b, c, d) Public information, agency rules, opinions, orders, records
23 and proceedings." (Dkt. No. 7.) While Ms. Sariol's Complaint included a lengthy "Statement of
24

1 Case,” it was largely unintelligible such that the Court was unable to comprehend the basis for
2 the claim.

3 On February 25, 2019, the Court dismissed Plaintiff’s Complaint under 28 U.S.C. §
4 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face. (Dkt. No. 8.)

5 On March 13, 2019, Ms. Sariol filed an emergency Motion for Case Reinstatement.
6 (Dkt. No. 11.) Because a “Motion for Case Reinstatement” is not recognized in this district, the
7 Court will treat Ms. Sariol’s Motion as one for reconsideration, pursuant to LCR 7(h). Motions
8 for reconsideration are disfavored and are ordinarily denied “in the absence of a showing of
9 manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not
10 have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” See LCR 7(h)(1).
11 Additionally, motions for reconsideration must be filed “within fourteen days after the order to
12 which it relates is filed.” LCR 7(h)(2).

13 Ms. Sariol’s Motion is untimely and does not provide the Court with sufficient
14 justification for reconsideration. Instead of correcting the deficiencies in her previous
15 Complaint, Ms. Sariol raises new facts without explaining how those facts give rise to a
16 cognizable claim for relief. Even giving Ms. Sariol, a *pro se* plaintiff, the benefit of any doubt,
17 see Karim-Panahi v. Los Angeles Police Dept., 839 F.2d 621, 623 (9th Cir. 1988), she again fails
18 to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face. The Court therefore DENIES the Motion
19 for Reinstatement.

20 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

21 Dated March 14, 2019.

22 

23 Marsha J. Pechman
24 United States District Judge